



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/870,591 06/06/97 ESCH

H 08594327

EXAMINER
----------

IM52/0207

CUSHMAN DARBY & CUSHMAN  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP OF PILLSBURY  
MADISON & SUTRO  
9TH FLOOR 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

HENDRICKSON, S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1754  
DATE MAILED:

02/07/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

870591

Applicant(s)

Esuh

Examiner

Hendrickson

Group Art Unit

1704

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/30/2000
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1754

The request filed on 11/3/02000 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/870,591 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A) In claim 8, 'good' is subjective and thus unclear.

B) In claims 10 and 11, fineness is unclear. Is average size meant?

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lagarde et al.

This is essentially the same rejection made in the examiner's answer (incorporated herein by reference), further noting that the intended use does not limit the product claimed. The fineness is deemed possessed since the other properties appear to be- see also column 13 middle.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Johnson et al. '750.

This is essentially the same rejection made in the examiner's answer (incorporated herein by reference), further noting that the intended use does not limit the product claimed. The fineness is deemed possessed since the other properties appear to be; a size of 6 microns is taught.

Application/Control Number: 08/870,591

Page 3

Art Unit: 1754

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart Hendrickson", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Stuart Hendrickson  
examiner Art Unit 1754